UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,192 06/16/2005		Gordon Feingold	09138.0074	2551
	7590 01/28/201 GAN, HENDERSON,	EXAMINER		
901 NEW YOR	K AVENUE, NW	GORDON, BRIAN R		
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1773	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/28/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/539,192	FEINGOLD ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
	Art Offic		

		Brian R. Gordon	1//3					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE	REPLY FILED 25 January 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.					
	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
	The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is late no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Exter	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 nsions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex	06.07(f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1	36(a) and the appropria	te extension fee				
under set fo may i NOT	r 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sorth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) ICE OF APPEAL	shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dath.	inally set in the final Offi te of the final rejection,	ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed,				
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed SNDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since				
3. 🛛	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered b	ecause				
	(a) They raise new issues that would require further co							
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	• •						
	(c)   ∑ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
	NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).						
4.	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
3. <b>_</b>			timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7. 🛛	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro-		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
	Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>358-385</u> .							
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
4FFI	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
В. 🗀	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. 🗀	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio			•				
	<u>UEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	it does NOT place the application in	o condition for allowa	ace hecause:				
		it does NOT place the application if	r condition for allowar	ice because.				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)  13. Other:								
		/Brian R Gordon/						
		Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1773					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant has amended the claims to include limitations not previously considered examined. The claims did not previously require a robotic head coupled to the stainer. Is should be noted that the phrase "coupled to" does not require the robotic head to be an element of the stainer or vice versa. It is only required that the two devices be connected in some manner. It was not previously required that the inserting step occur during the processing of at least one other sample. It is assumed the phrase means other than the second sample. It should be noted that the phrase "at least one other sample" is not limited to the first sample. For example, one can choose to perform the inserting step during the processing of a third sample and of course this would not interrupt the processing of the first sample because the first sample is not being processed. Furthermore, it should be noted the phrase "and optionally" means the same as "or". Therefore, it is only required that one or the other be inserted. Furthermore the scope of the dependent claims have also been changed. The amendments to the claims also create new 112 issues. For example, in claims 377 and 378, it is unclear which stainer is being referenced by the phrase "the stainer".